has had some problems in the courts in Florida. And as Chair of the Membership Committee for the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, she ended up putting in a membership application to join the association. And that's how I became aware of this information.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Are you a member of that association?

THE WITNESS: I'm on the board of directors of that association, and I'm the Chair of the Membership Committee. She submitted an application for membership. The committee reviewed her application. She had put on her application that she had no ethical violations. The Membership Committee was, at that point, ready to approve her membership based on her application when members of the State of Florida and the State of Washington submitted information to us from a court in Florida where she got chewed out by the court for some ethical violations. And at that

1	point, the committee decided that we needed to
2	check with our legal counsel, which we did.
3	The legal counsel said unless there was some
4	sort of action taken on her license that we
5	were required to accept her membership. The
6	Membership Committee then decided, based on
7	counsel's advice, that we would accept her
8	membership.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: What is this
10	organization again?
11	THE WITNESS: It's the Association
12	for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Association for
14	Treatment of Sexual Abusers.
15	THE WITNESS: Yes.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. And is that
17	a nationwide
18	THE WITNESS: It's an
19	international organization.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: International. How
21	many members does it have, roughly?
22	THE WITNESS: Twenty-eight
1	

hundred.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

JUDGE SIPPEL: Twenty-eight

hundred. Thank you.

BY MR. LYON:

Q And the fact that she got chewed out by a judge, what makes you conclude that she's not a respected sex offense researcher?

Well, I'll tell you, since we accepted her membership, I have had nothing but grief from members of the Washington Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, which I'm also a member, as well as members of the Florida Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers. They were furious with us over accepting her into the organization. No matter how much we tried to explain that, look, there was no action taken against her license and we had to do this on the attorney's advice, to this day we still get grief, I still get grief over the fact that we accepted her into the organization.

Q Okay. Do you believe that the

1	MSOST is an obsolete measure of the potential
2	for sexual recidivism?
3	A I believe that it is not the best
4	tool that could be used.
5	Q It is true, is it not, that Dr.
6	Epperson never held it out as a finished
7	actuarial product but only as a research tool?
8	A Yes, that's true.
9	Q Are you aware that Hansen and
10	Bussiere
11	A Bussiere.
12	Q Bussiere 1996 and 1998 meta
13	assessment study of various actuarial tools?
14	A I am.
15	Q And didn't Hansen and Bussiere in
16	that study find that many MSOST items did not
17	hold up on cross validation?
18	A That's true.
19	Q And are you aware that Epperson
20	has conceded that the MSOST has only modest
21	predictive ability?
22	A What is the source of that

1	information?
2	Q Hold on a second. I will actually
3	get it for you.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: We're off the
5	record while counsel finds it.
6	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
7	went off the record at 11:21 a.m. and went
8	back on the record at 11:23 a.m.)
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Back on the record.
10	BY MR. LYON:
11	Q We are going to have to come back
12	to that because we're having difficulty
13	finding that. So I take it from your question
14	that you are not aware of whether Epperson has
15	conceded that the MSOST has only modest
16	predictive ability?
17	A I'm not aware of that.
18	Q Okay. Are you aware that the
19	MSOST sample was only of 256 Minnesota sex
20	offenders released between 1988 and 1993?
21	A I'm not aware of that.
22	Q In your testimony, you list

1	certain dynamic factors that you think may
2	have an effect on sexual recidivism.
3	A Yes.
4	Q They are sexual preoccupation?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Victim access?
7	A Yes.
8	Q Hostility?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Employment and residence
11	instability?
12	A Yes.
13	Q Substance abuse?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Collapse of social support?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Rejection of supervision?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Nonconformity?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Can you point me to any peer
22	review literature which validates these as

1	risk factors for sexual re-offense?
2	A Well, actually, Dr. Andrew Harris
3	did a, he's done the Stable 2000 and the Acute
4	2000, and now he's doing the Stable and Acute
5	2007. And Dr. Harris and I both presented it
6	jointly regarding the acute risk factors for
7	re-offense, and those are in the Acute. So
8	that's been presented before ATSA.
9	Q And ATSA is?
10	A The Association for the Treatment
11	of Sexual Abusers. It's a
12	Q And what I'm sorry, go ahead.
13	A ATSA holds a conference every year
14	in which all of the researchers, clinicians in
15	the field attend, and a lot of these topics
16	are discussed and reviewed, and there's all
17	kinds of poster sessions. There's plenary
18	sessions. There's all kinds of the latest and
19	greatest information, and sex offender
20	research is discussed at these conferences.
21	Q Okay. And the conference where
22	Dr. Harris presented this study is when?

1	A 2006 I believe it was. He's
2	presenting again this year at the conference,
3	as well.
4	Q Do you have any evidence that Mr.
5	Titus directs his sexual interest any longer
6	toward minors?
7	A I do not.
8	Q In terms of antisocial
9	orientation, have you been made aware of a
10	number of character witness statements made on
11	behalf of Mr. Titus?
12	A I have.
13	Q Have you reviewed them?
14	A I have.
15	Q Do you believe that, based upon
16	your understanding of Mr. Titus' record and
17	the character witness statements that you've
18	reviewed, do you believe that Mr. Titus has an
19	antisocial orientation?
20	A Well, I believe that, based on his
21	convictions, based on the charges that were
22	eventually dismissed, based on his actuarial

risk assessment that we did, based on his 1 2 motor vehicle accident that he had, incident at Mercer Island, I do believe that 3 4 Mr. Titus is a high risk to re-offend. 5 My question was do you believe 6 that he is antisocial? 7 I'm not a psychologist. I'm not qualified to diagnose antisocial personality 8 9 disorder. 10 JUDGE SIPPEL: Can Ι ask a question to you? I don't want to have to come 11 12 back to it because it's clear in my mind. You 13 said that because of the automobile situation, automobile accident, and the Mercer Island 14 15 incident, among other things of course, but you included those two items in your list of 16 17 categories, list of items, that he would be likely to, I guess you would say more likely 18 19 than not likely to re-offend, yes, to re-20 offend? Am I using the word properly? 21 THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor, you 22 are.

1 JUDGE SIPPEL: Re-offend, meaning that he would be more likely to violate his 2 obligations with respect to sexual involvement 3 4 with young people, is that --5 THE WITNESS: Or that he would be more likely to re-offend in a sexual way. 6 7 JUDGE SIPPEL: We're only interested here in the sexual offenses against 8 9 young people. You say no? 10 THE WITNESS: No, I understand what you're saying. But what I'm saying is 11 that because of everything that I have just 12 13 said --14 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. 15 THE WITNESS: -- that it is my opinion, based on all of this information, 16 plus my many years of experience in this area, 17 that Mr. Titus is more likely to re-offend in 18 19 a sexual way, whether it be children. His 20 preference at the time was children. He's 21 still a high risk to re-offend in a sexual

way.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, he's never
2	I'll leave it there, and, certainly, you know,
3	I respect all of the things that you said in
4	terms of why you're coming to that conclusion.
5	I'm just bothered by the fact that you would
6	want to include the automobile situation, the
7	accident situation, and the Mercer Island
8	situation.
9	THE WITNESS: May I explain, your
10	Honor?
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Please. Yes,
12	please do. That's what I'm asking.
13	THE WITNESS: As we talked about
14	yesterday, most sex crimes are crimes of power
15	and control. Not all, but most all are crimes
16	of power and control. We have a situation
17	with the automobile accident where the victim
18	in the automobile accident thought that Mr.
19	Titus was putting himself out to be a law
20	enforcement officer.
21	MR. LYON: Objection to the extent
22	of the witness is purporting to testify as to

what someone else has.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm not going to, I'm going to overrule the objection on a limited basis. I'm concerned, I want to just hear what the reasoning of the Detective is with respect to those two incidents.

THE WITNESS: And in the accident report, the victim even states she asked him, "Are you a law enforcement officer?" and he refused to answer. Then we get to the Mercer Island incident where he's got his sheriff's hat, he's got a small badge from King County Sheriff's Department, and he's got flashlight commonly used by police. you know, it makes it look like he is trying to make himself look like a law enforcement We have him still putting his officer. sheriff hat in his vehicle where people in the neighborhood where he lives believe, because cf the antennas on the back of his vehicle, the fact that he's got the sheriff's hat on the dashboard, they believe that he is a

1	police officer. He's all playing to power and
2	control.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well, I
4	know, I mean I know just up the block, up
5	Independence Avenue I can buy myself a CIA
6	hat, an FBI hat, a protected witness shirt.
7	This paraphernalia, unless it's well,
8	again, I know. You've answered my question.
9	You've answered my question. I understand
10	where you're coming from, and that's all that
11	I intended to do. You may proceed.
12	MR. LYON: Thank you. But you're
13	stealing my cross examination.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm sorry. I get
15	curious once in a while.
16	MR. LYON: That's all right.
17	BY MR. LYON:
18	Q Detective, in terms of age, isn't
19	it true that studies show that the highest
20	incidence of risk for an offender is in the
21	20s?
22	A That's correct

That's correct.

Α

1	Q And Mr. Titus is in his mid-30s
2	now, isn't he?
3	A I believe so.
4	Q And his conviction was when he was
5	18, correct?
6	A Well, one of his convictions was
7	when he was 18.
8	Q Well, you might be confusing
9	convictions in juvenile adjudication.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's be specific.
11	Ask him
12	BY MR. LYON:
13	Q His juvenile adjudications were 15
14	and under, correct?
15	A He had two adjudications when he
16	was 15 and under, yes.
17	Q Okay. And he had a conviction at
18	18, correct?
19	A Well, we're doing semantics here.
20	The adjudication is the same as a conviction.
21	It's just juvenile court versus adult court.
22	Q It may be in your mind, but the

1	law does make a distinction. It does call it
2	an adjudication if you're a juvenile, and a
3	conviction if you're an adult.
4	A That's true. Remember the federal
5	Adam Walsh Act, it says that adjudications and
6	convictions are to be considered convictions.
7	Q I understand that. Nevertheless,
8	Mr. Titus' adjudications and convictions were
9	when he was under 20.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm sorry. Answer
11	that question, and then I'll butt in again.
12	Go ahead. I'm sorry. You want to ask him the
13	question, you can
14	THE WITNESS: You're correct, Mr.
15	Lyon.
16	MR. LYON: Okay. Go ahead, your
17	Honor.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: The Adam Walsh, you
19	kind of brought in that Adam Walsh. This gets
20	to be a little bit disturbing because, as I
21	understand it, you basically are rejecting
22	Adam Walsh as a, I'm not going to say as

inappropriate but that it is not, Adam Walsh 1 is not the way to go in this program. 2 3 basically what you have concluded. 4 THE WITNESS: I don't believe that Unfortunately, the Congress of the 5 United States and the Attorney General believe 6 it is. 7 8 JUDGE SIPPEL: I appreciate that, 9 and I recognize that. But if Adam Walsh is 10 not the way to go in your opinion, there's no reason to bring Adam Walsh into 11 12 your assessment of Mr. Titus, unless I'm being 13 led to believe something else. 14 THE WITNESS: Well, the State of Washington has not ratified the Adam Walsh Act 15 16 yet. In a political year, like this is, and 17 the state has to do it this year, this next 18 legislative session, there's every reason to believe that it is going to be passed. 19 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: Whether it is or 21 not is irrelevant as far as I am concerned. 22 Mr. Titus is on the books as a level-three

offender, and he's on the books as a level-three offender because, basically, you put him there. And you did it on the basis of certain test standards and all that you're testifying to today. You didn't put him there because of Adam Walsh.

THE WITNESS: No, that's exactly right. Yesterday, though, under Adam Walsh, he would be a tier three.

really care about that. For purposes of your testimony, for purposes of your participation in the Titus situation has got nothing to do at all with Adam Walsh. That's a legislative matter. As you say, you've given all the good reasons why it may very well become law, but we're focusing here today on the standards that you applied when you assigned him the level three. And the record is clear, I think it's getting clearer all the time, but I just don't want to drag Adam Walsh into it to say, well, maybe he was really thinking of Adam

1	Walsh, too. You weren't?
2	THE WITNESS: No, no, not at all.
3	My only point was is that under Adam Walsh
4	Act, if the state chooses to pass that, he
5	will still be a tier three.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. All right,
7	all right, I see. Okay. I understand better
8	now.
9	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: You got off
10	the point, though. I think the question was
11	are adjudications and convictions treated the
12	same way, and you were saying that Adam Walsh
13	says that they're to be treated the same way.
14	THE WITNESS: Yes.
15	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: And Mr. Lyon
16	was going forward from there. Did I
17	MR. LYON: Well, I didn't ask that
18	question. I had asked the question whether
19	the law, in terms of Washington State treats
20	them differently, at least calls them
21	differently. I mean, I can get into the whole
22	concept of the justice program, but I don't

1	think we need to.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: No. And, in fact,
3	I'm going to really strike the answer as being
4	responsive with respect to Adam Walsh.
5	MR. LYON: Okay. That's fine,
6	your Honor.
7	BY MR. LYON:
8	Q Let me move on. Just to be clear,
9	Mr. Titus has lived in the community now for
10	14 years, and it's been 16 years since he was
11	charged with his offense, right?
12	A Yes.
13	Q Okay. Now, there came a time when
14	you received a report on Mr. Titus from the
15	Mercer Island Department of Public Safety?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Okay. That occurs on or about
18	July 7 of '04?
19	A I would have to look at the
20	report. If you say that was the date then
21	Q I'll represent that as the date,
22	but if you want to refresh your recollection

1	I would suggest you refer to Exhibit 4, page
2	38.
3	A Okay.
4	MS. LANCASTER: I believe it's 38
5	through 40.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, he's only
7	asking with respect to 38, though. Is that
8	right?
9	MR. LYON: Well, 38 or any other
10	page necessary to refresh the witness'
11	recollection as to the date. I will represent
12	that it is in evidence and dated 7/7/04.
13	THE WITNESS: I see it. And it is
14	dated 7/7/04.
15	BY MR. LYON:
16	Q Okay. Now, in response to
17	receiving the report from the Mercer Island
18	Department of Public Safety, you raised Mr.
19	Titus to a level three?
20	A That, in addition to the motor
21	vehicle accident, yes.
22	Q Okay. Now, you said that he was

1	caught with a King County hat, a KEL-Light,
2	and a King County badge necklace
3	A Yes.
4	Q is that correct? Okay. And
5	did you
6	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Objection,
7	your Honor. I'm not sure he testified that
8	there was a King County hat.
9	MS: LANCASTER: Sheriff's hat.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: It was a sheriff's
11	hat.
12	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: I think that
13	the clear testimony that it was just a
14	sheriff's hat, and I don't think you asked him
15	
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: His objection is is
17	that he didn't testify to a King's County hat,
18	he testified to a sheriff's hat.
19	MR. LYON: Actually, your Honor, I
20	wasn't asking about testimony. I was asking
21	about a prior statement.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Some other --

1	MR. LYON: By the witness.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: By the witness?
3	MR. LYON: Right.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Do you
5	have the source of the prior statement?
6	MR. LYON: Absolutely.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well,
8	why don't you ask the witness just straight up
9	then? Maybe he recollects it. Maybe he
10	recollects what you're asking.
11	BY MR. LYON:
12	Q Do you recollect saying that Mr.
13	Titus was caught with a King county hat, a
14	KEL-Light, and a King County badge necklace?
15	A I believe I did say that.
16	Q I'm sorry. Your voice is so soft
17	sometimes, I can't hear you.
18	A I said I believe I did say that.
19	Q All right. And, in fact, you e-
20	mailed Tina Keller to indicate that you were
21	raising his level to a level three?
22	A Yes.

1	Q And, in fact, you said, you told
2	her, quote, "Show this clown as a level three
3	on your web site?"
4	A I did.
5	Q I'm not familiar with that term.
б	Is clown an official police term?
7	A No, that was an indiscretion on my
8	part.
9	Q In other words, you were treating
10	Mr. Titus with some degree of derision?
11	A Some degree of what?
12	Q Derision.
13	A I'm not sure what that means.
14	Q Contempt.
15	A I was irritated at the time, yes.
16	Q And was this before or after you
17	made the evaluation to move him up to a level
18	three?
19	A Was what before or after?
20	Q When you sent the e-mail to
21	A Tina Keller?
22	Q Tina Keller and said we're

1	showing this clown as a level three.
2	A We had already raised him to a
3	level three, and then she was notified to show
4	him as a level three on their web site.
5	Q Okay. Now, in fact, he was caught
6	washing his hands after using the bathroom,
7	isn't that right?
8	A I recall he was caught in the
9	bathroom. I don't know what he was doing in
10	the bathroom.
11	Q The investigating officer accused
12	him of shooting paint balls against the wall.
13	A Well, I know that's allegedly why
14	the officer stopped to begin with because he
15	saw paint ball splatters on the wall of the
16	bathroom, so he stopped investigating.
17	Q Okay. I think it might have been
18	a she, but there's nothing that indicates that
19	Mr. Titus had a paint ball gun, is there?
20	A No.
21	Q And there's nothing to indicate
22	that he had paint balls?

1	A No.
2	Q Now, in the connection with this,
3	we'll call it a stop by the officer; is that
4	the correct term?
5	A Yes, sir.
6	Q Okay. In connection with this
7	stop, Mr. Titus voluntarily allowed the
8	officer to search his vehicle or allowed an
9	officer to search his vehicle?
10	. A Yes.
11	Q Okay. And as a result of that
12	voluntary search, the officer found a hat that
13	said "sheriff," right?
14	A Yes.
15	Q It didn't say "King County
16	Sheriff, " right?
17	A I'm not sure if it said King
18	County Sheriff or what it said.
19	Q Okay. Nevertheless, you told Tina
20	Keller that it said King County Sheriff,
21	right?
22	A I believe I did.

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	Q Okay. So is it fair to say that
2	you made the assumption that it said King
3	County Sheriff?
4	A That would be fair.
5	Q And I take it that you speculate
6	that Mr. Titus was trying to impersonate a
7	police officer?
8	A Not at that time.
9	Q Did you ever come to that
10	conclusion?
11	A No, but I find it unusual that
12	somebody whose crimes are of power and control
13	would have a symbol of power and control in
14	their vehicle.
15	Q Do you understand that Mr. Titus
16	has stated that he had a friend who was a King
17	County sheriff who gave him that hat?
18	A I understand that he said that,
19	but he would never identify who that was so we
20	could check it out.
21	Q It's not illegal to have such a
22	hat?